



1982

## Videotape Modeling Of Self-Disclosing Behavior In Counselor Trainees In Practicum Experiences

Manouchehr Moshggou  
*University of the Pacific*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Moshggou, Manouchehr. (1982). *Videotape Modeling Of Self-Disclosing Behavior In Counselor Trainees In Practicum Experiences*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. [https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop\\_etds/3529](https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3529)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgebney@pacific.edu](mailto:mgebney@pacific.edu).

VIDEOTAPE MODELING OF SELF-DISCLOSING  
BEHAVIOR IN COUNSELOR TRAINEES IN  
PRACTICUM EXPERIENCES

A Dissertation  
Presented to  
The Faculty of the Graduate School  
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment of  
the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

by  
Manouchehr Moshggou  
April 1982

This dissertation, written and submitted by

Manoochehr Moshgou

is approved for recommendation to the Committee  
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

Oscar F. Jarvis

Dissertation Committee:

Wm C. Heininger Jr. Chairman

Fred Muskal

Donald Dunes

Michael L. Davis

Mari E. Quinn

Dated May 5, 1982

## Abstract of Dissertation

### VIDEOTAPE MODELING OF SELF-DISCLOSING BEHAVIOR IN COUNSELOR TRAINEES IN PRACTICUM EXPERIENCES

This study investigated the effects of videotape modeling of self-disclosing behavior on counselor trainees. More specifically, the study was designed to determine whether an increased willingness to disclose one's attitudes and opinions in appropriate situations could be taught to counselor trainees as part of their training.

The subjects were two groups of counselor trainees selected, not on a random basis, but on the basis of their availability from two different sections in the Counseling Practicum at Fresno State University. One group (the Experimental group, with 12 counselors) was provided self-disclosing training, and the other was not provided self-disclosing training and was labeled the Control group (with 14 counselors).

At the beginning, and at the end of the study the Self-Disclosure Situational Survey (SDSS) was administered to each of the subjects. Both groups were assigned clients and audiotapes of their sessions were recorded. All subjects were rated in terms of self-disclosure, using Carkhuff Scales by two judges after a three week period. They also were rated by their clients on Relationship Inventory (RI).

The analysis of covariance was used to analyze the relationship between the pre-test and the post-test on the counselor trainees' SDSS score. Three 2x2 ANOVA's were used to study the interaction and interrelationship of the independent variables, sex and treatment, on the remaining dependent variables. These dependent variables were: 1) student trainees' self-disclosure on SDSS, 2) students' clients' self-disclosure on SDSS, 3) the rating of the judges on the Carkhuff's Scale, and 4) the rating of clients on the RI.

This study found that counselor trainees using videotape modeling of self-disclosing behavior demonstrated an increase in self-disclosing behavior. There appeared to be a significant positive relationship between the counselors' self-disclosure and the outcome of the

counseling. Clients of the counselors in this study who took the training did not show more self-disclosing behavior than did clients of counselors who did not receive the training. In addition, the sex of the subjects did not appear to be an important factor in self-disclosure in an adult sample.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed their time and interest in the completion of this dissertation. I would like to thank the committee persons, Dr. Michael Davis; Dr. Fred Muskal; Dr. Donald Duns and Dr. Mari Irwin. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. William C. Theimer, Jr., my advisor, teacher and chairperson, for his guidance and encouragement during this investigation.

Special thanks are given to Dr. Robert Monke and the Counselors of the California State University at Fresno who had part in making this study possible. And, to my wife Victoria, for her continuous and invaluable support.

M.M.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	
	Introduction to the Study . . . . .	1
	The Problem . . . . .	4
	Statement of the Problem . . . . .	4
	Hypotheses . . . . .	4
	Need and Justification for the Study . .	6
	Method and Techniques of Research . . . .	7
	Definition of Terms . . . . .	9
	Organization of the Report . . . . .	11
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	
	Theoretical Construct of Self-Disclosure . . . . .	12
	Definitions of Self-Disclosure . . . . .	13
	Self-Disclosure Flexibility . . . . .	16
	Demographic and Biological Characteristics . . . . .	19
	Therapist's Self-Disclosure . . . . .	21
	Trust-Attraction . . . . .	24
	Social Exchange . . . . .	25
	Modeling . . . . .	25
	Summary of Therapist's Self-Disclosure . . . . .	26
	Development of Self-Disclosure Inventories . . . . .	27
	Impact of Videotape Recording in Counseling . . . . .	32

Use of Videotape in Therapy . . . . .	32
Videotape Used in Non-Counseling Setting to Change Behavior . . . . .	34
Summary . . . . .	35
III. PROCEDURES	
Selection of the Subjects . . . . .	37
Administration of Pre-Test Self-Disclosure Situation Survey . . . . .	38
Objectives of the Course . . . . .	38
Methods . . . . .	39
Observation of Videotape Model . . . . .	40
Self-Disclosure Activities . . . . .	40
Illustration of Self-Disclosure Scale . . . . .	40
Observing and Rating of Videotape Model . . . . .	42
Perceiving Self-Disclosure . . . . .	43
Responding with Self-Disclosure . . . . .	45
Sharing Exercises . . . . .	47
Instrumentation . . . . .	49
Self-Disclosure Situational Survey . . . . .	49
Relationship Inventory . . . . .	51
Carkhuff's Scale . . . . .	52
Hypotheses, Data Analysis and the Variables . . . . .	53
Hypotheses . . . . .	53
Data Analysis and Variables . . . . .	55



	Summary . . . . .	56
IV.	RESULTS . . . . .	
	Inferential Test of Hypotheses . . . . .	57
	Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	57
	Hypothesis 5a . . . . .	58
	Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	58
	Hypothesis 5b . . . . .	59
	Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	59
	Hypothesis 5c . . . . .	59
	Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	60
	Hypothesis 5d . . . . .	60
	Summary . . . . .	60
V.	ANALYSIS, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	
	Summary and Discussion . . . . .	66
	Conclusions . . . . .	71
	Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	72
	Conclusion . . . . .	72
	REFERENCES . . . . .	74
	APPENDICES . . . . .	86

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Results of Analysis of Covariance for Students' Scores on Self-Disclosure Situational Survey . . . . .	61
2. Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Judges' Rating Treatment by Sex . . .	62
3. Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Relationship Inventory Scores Treatment by Sex . . . . .	63
4. Results of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Client Self-Disclosure Situational Survey Treatment by Sex . . . . .	64

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

The importance of the use of different applications of mechanical media such as simulation films and tapes in guidance and counselor education has been noted by Kagan, (1970). He indicated that one of the important contributions that technology can provide seems to be its ability to extend the level of creativity, imagination, and potential of educators and students by reproducing potentially threatening situations on film, videotape or audiotape within a laboratory setting.

The application of video simulation and video modeling has been a useful technique for training counselors. It has also been valuable in a variety of counseling and training situations directed toward helping people change certain interpersonal behavior (Kagan & Krathwohl, 1967).

Walz & Johnston (1963) employed videotape to record counseling sessions and discovered that counselor trainees who viewed the tapes seemed to gain greater self-awareness and personal confidence. The major findings of their investigation suggested that videotaping offered promise

as a unique manner of assisting counselors to view their counseling performance.

Videotape recording was used in conjoint marital therapy to increase the marital partner's awareness of multiple channels of communication (Alger & Hogan, 1967). It was also used as a modeling technique designed to help clients elicit self-disclosure and to improve client understanding of counseling expectations (Wuehler, 1975).

An important part of many contemporary schools of psychotherapy, especially those influenced by existentialism and the human potential movement, emphasizes therapist self disclosure (Johnson, 1971). Self disclosure is the hypothesis proposed by Jourard in 1964, that willing, "transparent" presentation of the self to another person facilitates interpersonal health and interpersonal relationships and contributes to physical health. "Transparency" is defined as the honest attempt by a person to reveal his innermost thoughts and feelings. Jourard devised a questionnaire which asks how much a person has told to selected others on various topics in the past.

While client self-disclosure has always been encouraged in therapy, some schools of psychotherapy such as existentialism have broken the dictum of the non-revealing therapist and permit, if not encourage,

therapist self-disclosure (Johnson, 1971). Research concerned with therapist's self-disclosure in therapist-client interaction (Simonson et al., 1970; Goodman, 1962), interviewer self-disclosure in interviewer-interviewee interactions (Jourard & Jaffe, 1970), and experimenter self-disclosure in experimenter-subject interactions (Drag, 1968) suggests the existence of what Jourard calls the "dyadic effect" of self-disclosure. The "dyadic effect" was defined as the increase in self-disclosing behavior which results from one person receiving open feelings from another; i.e., the self-disclosure of one person facilitates the emission of self-disclosure from the others (Jourard, 1964; Levin & Gergen, 1969). The "dyadic effect" was studied with a questionnaire designed to measure disclosure output to and intake from target persons. Substantial correlations were found between the measures of disclosure-output and disclosure-input with regard to all target persons (Jourard & Richman, 1963).

Data from the notions of "distributive justice" (Homans, 1961), or "norm of reciprocity" (Gouldner, 1960) suggested that a person in a self-disclosure exchange situation will disclose more intimate information to those from whom he has received more intimate information.

These findings indicated the "dyadic effect" to be a major factor in disclosure behavior.

## 1. THE PROBLEM

### Statement of the problem

The most effective communication between two individuals is direct and honest communication. Since the major process involved in counseling is communication, then self-disclosing is one of the core dimensions of the interpersonal relationships in counseling situations. If a counselor's self-disclosure plays a significant role in positive counselor-client interaction, it is important to discover ways in which this behavior can be taught. Specifically, there is a need to examine the effects of videotape modeling of self-disclosing behavior on counselor trainees. More specifically, can an increased willingness to disclose be taught to counselor trainees as a part of their training? Also, to what degree, if any, does videotape modeling enhance self-disclosing behavior on counselor trainees? Furthermore, if there is a change in self-disclosing behavior, does this change contribute to the development of rapport between counselor and client?

### The Hypotheses

In attempting to answer the above questions, the following five hypotheses are set forth:

- H<sub>1</sub> Regardless of sex, students who were given videotape training in self-disclosure, the experimental group, will show more self-disclosing behavior than students who did not receive videotape training in self-disclosure, the control group, as measured by the Self-Disclosure Situational Survey (SDSS).
- H<sub>2</sub> Regardless of sex, students in the experimental group will be rated higher than those of the control group by independent judges in terms of self-disclosing behavior.
- H<sub>3</sub> Regardless of sex, students in the experimental group will be rated higher than those of the control group by their clients in terms of development of rapport as measured by the Relationship Inventory (RI).
- H<sub>4</sub> Regardless of sex, clients of students who were in the experimental group will show more self-disclosing behavior than clients of students in the control group as measured by SDSS.
- H<sub>5</sub> There will be no difference between sexes on any of the four variables.

## II. NEED AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THE STUDY

Jourard's further investigation of disclosure and its relationship to the well-being of man were reported in his book The Transparent Self (1964). The working hypothesis of this book was "man can attain to health and fuller functioning only insofar as he gains courage to be himself among others". In Disclosing Man to Himself (1968), Jourard maintained that self-disclosure is a healthy behavior for everyone, psychotherapists, counselors, as well as laymen. He found that "disclosure begets disclosure"; that is to say, I tell you about me, and you in turn tell me about you.

Jourard differentiates between what he calls the "public self" and the "real self". The "public self" is the view of a person that he/she desires others to believe; the "real self" is similar to what Rogers call "authentic". For Jourard, people are acting their "real selves" when they behave the way they feel, not how they think others think they should behave. The way to attain this "real self" according to Jourard, is to engage in self-disclosure.

Other research dealing with counselor self-disclosure in counselor-client interaction has shown that the counselor who made warm, accepting, self-disclosing remarks to the client impressed subjects as being the



most nurturant and elicited the greatest willingness to self-disclose (Bundya & Simonson, 1973). Truax and Carkhuff (1965) have also reported significant correlation between therapist and client disclosure. Altman and Taylor (1973) have developed theories to account for self-disclosure in relationships as they develop over time. They have shown that reciprocal disclosures between people follow an orderly and systematic process.

It appeared that self-disclosure often serves to define the reciprocal role within counseling relationships, and should play a significant role in counselor training. There appeared to be a need to investigate (1) whether self-disclosing behavior can be taught using videotape as part of counseling skills in a practicum experience, and (2) whether the effect of this training can be perceived in counselor behaviors by supervisors and clients.

### III. THE METHOD AND TECHNIQUES OF RESEARCH

The method of research was an experimental study using two groups of counselor trainees to whom the SDSS was administered. The procedure was as follows:

1. Two groups of counselor trainees were selected, not on a random basis, but on the basis of their availability in the two

different sections in Counseling Practicum at Fresno State University. One group was provided self-disclosure training and was labeled the experimental group (E) and the other was not provided this training and was labeled the control group (C).

2. At the beginning and at the end of the study, the SDSS was administered to each of the subjects.
3. The E group participated in five hours of treatment, in which they observed videotape models of self-disclosing behavior, engaged in self-disclosure activities and observed another videotape model of self-disclosing behavior.
4. The C group also participated in five hours of treatment, in which they observed videotapes and models of non-revealing "interviewing techniques" followed by role playing to practice the "interviewing techniques" and then observed another videotape model.
5. Both groups were assigned clients in which audiotapes of their counseling sessions were recorded. E students were provided

feedback in terms of self-disclosure with their clients on a weekly basis for three weeks, following the videotape presentation.

6. All subjects were rated in terms of self-disclosure, using Carkhuff scales, by two independent judges after a three-week period.
7. All subjects were rated by their clients on the RI.
8. The analysis of covariance was used to analyze the relationship between sex and training. A 2x2 ANCOVA was used to study the interaction and relationship between treatment and control groups and sex on the SDSS. Three 2x2 ANOVA's were used to test treatment and sex differences on the RI and Carkhuff scales taken by the E and C groups and the SDSS scales taken by clients of each of the E and C counselor trainees.

#### IV. DEFINITION OF TERMS

##### Self-Disclosure

"Self-disclosure may be defined as any information about himself which Person A communicates verbally to Person B" (Cozby, 1973, p.73). According to Chelune

(1979, p.2), this definition must meet the following criteria: "(1) it must contain personal information about Person A; (2) Person A must verbally communicate this information; and (3) Person A must communicate this information to target Person B".

#### Self-Disclosure Flexibility

"Self-disclosure flexibility...refers to the ability of an individual to modulate his or her characteristic disclosure levels according to the interpersonal and situational demands of various social situations" (Chelune, 1978, p.286).

#### Dyadic Effect

A reciprocal phenomenon of social relationship in which participants in dialogue disclose their thoughts, feelings, actions, and emotions to others and are disclosed to in return (Jourard, 1971).

#### "Public self and Real self"

These terms were developed by Jourard and were used in this study. "The public self is the view of ourselves that we desire others to believe, and real self is when we behave the way we feel, not how we think others think we should behave" (Jourard, 1968).

#### Counseling Practicum

A counseling course of instruction at California State University at Fresno which consisted of the following goals: a) to provide an opportunity for the

application of theoretical knowledge associated with counseling; b) to provide experiences toward the improvement of trainees' ability to communicate with clients; and c) to provide counseling service for students in public schools as well as for the general population.

#### Counselor Trainee

A graduate student who has completed all the requirements of the counseling program and is acquiring practical counseling experience and skill under faculty supervision.

#### Reciprocity

This term is used interchangeably with "dyadic effect" in this study.

### V. ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

Chapter II deals with a review of the literature pertinent to this study and Chapter III describes the procedures, the selection of the subjects, the instrumentation and discusses the statistical design, including the hypotheses to be tested. Chapter IV presents the analysis of data and the findings of the report. The final chapter presents a summary of the data, conclusions, and recommendations for further study and research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter two will present a review of the literature and related research relevant to the study of self-disclosure in counseling situations. The content of this chapter will be presented in four sections: a) the theoretical construct of self-disclosure; b) therapist's self-disclosure; c) development of Self-Disclosure Inventories; and d) impact of videotape recording in counseling situations.

#### Theoretical Construct of Self-Disclosure

The concept of self-disclosure has its roots in existential and humanistic philosophy of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, Buber, Rogers and Jourard (Chelune, 1979). To disclose means to make known, to show or reveal. "Self-disclosure is the act of making yourself manifest, showing yourself so others can perceive you" (Jourard, 1971).

Buber (1937) had proposed that through more intimate and deeper experiences with others, a person may engage himself in a richer self-experience and a more complete

relationship with God. Fromm (1955) speculated that a person's ability to disclose himself could be the only way to counteract the societal forces which contribute to the person's alienation in a contemporary society.

Jourard (1971), as one of the early advocates of self-disclosure, was impressed with the universal pattern which many of his clients shared in concealing authentic thoughts and feelings, in order to live a cosmetic life of pretense. One of Jourard's goals as a psychotherapist was to help clients live more authentically, to stop misrepresenting themselves to the people with whom they lived.

#### Definitions

Self-disclosure was the hypothesis proposed by Jourard in 1964. He speculated that willing, transparent presentation of the self to another person facilitates interpersonal relationships and interpersonal health and contributes to physical health. Transparency was defined as the honest attempt by a person to reveal his innermost thoughts and feelings. In the initial self-disclosure investigations based on subjects' own self-rating of their disclosure to important people in their lives, self-disclosure was defined from a personal perspective (Chelune, 1979). Jourard (1971) used the self construct to describe the revelation of personal

information to others. Such a disclosure was not seen as isolated acts conditioned only by external stimuli, but rather a critical prerequisite to become one's real self in relation to others.

According to Cozby (1973), p. 73), "self-disclosure may be defined as any information about himself which Person A communicates verbally to Person B." Worthy, Gary, and Kahn (1969, p.59), defined self-disclosure as "that which occurs when A knowingly communicates to B information about A which is not generally known and is not otherwise available to B." Pearce and Sharp (1973, p. 409), defined self-disclosure as "an invitation to share experience." Egan (1970) speculated that self-disclosure is "story" (present tense) rather than "history" (past tense).

Jourard (1964) hypothesized that man cannot know his true nature until such time as he has made it known to others. Once disclosure begins to take place, a person will better be able to know and understand himself. He maintained that self-disclosure will lead a person into better mental and physical well-being. He writes of a person's well-being:



...that accurate portrayal of the self to others is an identifying criterion of healthy personality, while neurosis is related to inability to know one's real self and to make it known to others (1958, p. 91).

In The Transparent Self, (1964), Jourard's main assumption was that man can attain to health and fuller functioning only when he gains courage to be himself among others. He brought attention to disclosing behavior as an important factor in personal development, and he further defined meaningful self-disclosure as the communication of the private world of an individual to another in a language that was clearly understandable. Such a communication was vital for psychological well-being because no man could know himself except as an outcome of disclosing himself to another person. Authentic self-revelation was seen, therefore, as a first step toward awareness of submerged thoughts and feelings. Openness provided a means of social comparison and reality testing that is essential to psychological growth.

Jourard differentiated between the "public self" and the "real self". The "public self" is the view of

a person that he desires others to know. The "real self" is similar to what Rogers called "authentic" (1961). For Jourard, a person is acting his real self when he behaves the way he feels, not how he thinks others think he should behave. The way to attain this real self according to Jourard is to engage in self-disclosure. He concluded in The Transparent Self that there was a strong correlation between health, both physical and mental, and self-disclosure.

#### Self-disclosure Flexibility

Self-disclosure has become a much-studied phenomenon. Various researchers have studied self-disclosure, but they have focused either on individual differences across social settings or on the situations that influence these individuals. Chelune (1979) differentiated what he called the key issue of "trait" or "state" view of self-disclosing behavior. He concluded:

Researchers must decide whether the focus of the study will be on individual differences in self-disclosure across social-situational content, or conversely, on the conditions or situations that influence self-disclosure across

individuals. This decision essentially requires the researchers to choose a "trait" or a "state" view of self-disclosure (1979, p.4).

Early studies of self-disclosure were primarily concerned with various individual difference variables and used the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire to measure past self-disclosure. Other studies (Snyder & Monson, 1975; Bem & Allen, 1974; Chelune, 1977) emphasized the limitation of taking a "state" or "trait" position and suggested the interaction of both person and situation variables in social setting. Jourard (1964) speculated that there is an optimal level of self-disclosure for a given situation, and a person whose level of disclosure is consistent across situations without regulating social content is least-liked. Other researchers suggested that the ability to regulate one's characteristic patterns of self-presentation on the basis of situational cues appears to be important for effective interpersonal functioning (Chaiken, Derlega, Bayman, and Shaw, 1975). Chelune (1975) has called such an ability self-disclosure flexibility and Snyder (1974) has termed this dimension self-monitoring. Self-disclosure flexibility

requires the individual, primarily, to differentiate interpersonal and situational variables such as topic of self-disclosure, target and setting condition, and secondarily, to adapt and regulate his or her disclosure behavior accordingly (Chelune, 1975). Individuals with high self-disclosure flexibility showed considerable situation-to-situation variability and could demonstrate appropriate self-disclosure in a social setting. Individuals with low self-disclosure flexibility were likely to show a trait-like view of self-disclosure (Chelune, 1979).

Derlega and Chaikin (1975) indicated that self-disclosure is always an interactional variable. The ability to discriminate between situations where disclosure is appropriate or not in a social setting is characteristic of a healthy person. They further assumed that positive mental health is related to appropriateness of self-disclosure which means that the time, occasion and the relationship between the disclosure and listener are all considered by the speaker. Luft (1969) also suggested that self-disclosure is appropriate only when it is part of an ongoing relationship and should be reciprocal and mutual between two people.

### Demographic and Biological Characteristics

Various investigators have studied self-disclosure in relation with sex, age, religion and nationality. Progress, however, has been hampered by definitional and measurement problems (Chelune, 1979). Furthermore, the literature on self-disclosure does not provide evidence of consistent relationships between self-disclosure and these variables (Archer, 1978). Most of these studies have examined sex as a variable. Jourard and Lasakow (1958), and Jourard and Richman (1963) found that females typically disclose more than males in nearly all subject areas and to all disclosure targets. Cash (1975) found that both sexes self-disclosed more to a female than to a male. Mulcahy (1973) reported that female same-sex disclosure was greater than male same-sex disclosure. Chelune (1976) found that females disclosed more intimate information but not more total information.

Other studies found that males and females engaged in the same amount of self-disclosure (Graff, 1976; Shapiro and Swensen, 1977), and one study (Sermat and Smyth, 1973) found that males disclosed more than females. Although 75 percent of the studies support Jourard's original proposition, numerous studies cast doubt on the general notion of sex differences in self-disclosure. The

research on sex differences in self-disclosing behavior has been limited to comparison of anatomical sex. Rosenfeld, Civikly, and Herron (1979) suggested that the focusing on psychological sex as well as on anatomical sex of both subjects and targets might clear some of the confusion of sex differences in self-disclosure studies.

Age does not appear to be an important factor in self-disclosure in adult samples (Plog, 1965). However, Jourard (1961) found a decrease in self-disclosure to targets of mother, father, and same-sex friend as age increased. An increase was reported in disclosure to other-sex friend or spouse up to age 40, with a general decrease thereafter.

Religious and cross-cultural differences in self-disclosure have been examined through the use of Jourard's questionnaire. When Methodist, Jewish, Baptist, and Catholic subjects were given self-disclosure questionnaires, there was no significant interaction between denomination and disclosure to the various target persons for either sex (Jourard, 1961). However, the Jewish males obtained disclosure totals significantly higher than those

found for each of the other three male groups, none of which differed significantly from each other.

### Summary of Research Relating to Theoretical Construct of Self-Disclosure

The definitions of self-disclosure research have been examined. It has been shown that there have been serious inconsistencies in the conceptual definitions used in self-disclosure research. While much of the research focused either on individual differences across social setting or on the situations that influence these individuals, the evidence supports the interaction of both person and situation variables in a social setting. Furthermore, the literature suggests that "appropriateness" and "self-monitoring" in self-disclosure are important factors for effective interpersonal functioning. The present study will use the interaction of both person and situation variables as the definition of self-disclosure in a counseling setting.

### Therapist's Self-Disclosure

While there exists a substantial body of literature relating a therapist's interpersonal communication to a number of variables, the concept of therapist's self-disclosure has attracted only a few counselors' attention. Pioneers of humanistic counseling such as Carkhuff and Perenson (1967), Jourard (1964), Patterson (1969),

Rogers (1962) and Truax and Carkhuff (1969) have emphasized the importance of the counselor's self-disclosing behavior. They described the counselor's self-references to his own attitudes and values as being important in genuine counseling interaction. Mowrer (1964) has suggested that the therapist's self-disclosure is essential to develop mutual honesty and trust and to enhance counseling relationships.

The self-disclosure reciprocity explanation is an extension of Gouldner's (1960) "norm of reciprocity". He speculated that individuals feel obligated to return the benefits they have received. Taylor (1979) suggested that personality and social content are important motivational aspects of self-disclosure.

Reciprocity is considered a factor and/or result of positive relationships (Jourard, 1959a, 1963, 1964; Jourard & Landsman, 1960; Jourard & Jaffee, 1970; Jourard & Resnick, 1970; Johnson, 1972; Cozby, 1973; Pearce & Sharp, 1973; Stein, 1975; Wilmot, 1975; Judd, 1978). According to this dyadic effect, people will tend to respond with disclosure to other people's disclosure, so that, over time, two people will disclose approximately the same amount of information to each other. In addition, the reciprocity factor implies that low disclosers will increase their disclosure when paired with



high disclosers, and that pairs of high disclosers will disclose more to each other than pairs of low disclosers.

Counselor disclosure specifically has been shown to facilitate client disclosure (Bundya & Simonson, 1973; Jourard, 1971a; Powell, 1968; Truax & Carkhuff, 1965). Jourard & Rickman (1963) studied the dyadic effect with a questionnaire designed to measure disclosure output to and intake from the target person. Substantial correlation was found between the measures of disclosure-output and disclosure-input with regard to all target persons. Both males and females reported more disclosure input than output in relation to all target persons except the mother, where input and output scores were similar. Female subjects in this study were found to have more disclosure to, and to have received more disclosure from, the various target persons than males. These findings indicated the dyadic effect to be a major factor in disclosing behavior.

On the other hand, conflicting results have been suggested by Branan (1967), who reported that counselor's self disclosure did not affect the client's ratings of the counselor's empathy and genuineness. Stunkel (1973) suggested that not all clients may favor counselor's self-disclosure. May and Thompson (1973) reported that clients with a low level of self-disclosure may react

negatively to self-disclosing counselors. Murphy (1973) used frequency of self-disclosure in counseling with college males and suggested that frequency of self-disclosure had no significant effect upon the client's perception of counseling interaction as measured by the Relationship Inventory (RI).

Cozby's (1973) review of the literature on self-disclosure provided compelling support to Jourard's claim that disclosure begets disclosure. Three different hypotheses have been advanced to explain the motives of disclosure reciprocity (Altman, 1973; Chaikin & Derlega, 1974). They are : trust-attraction, social exchange, and modeling.

Trust-attraction. The trust-attraction concept is the oldest explanation for the reciprocity effect and was originated by Jourard. This hypothesis speculated that intimate disclosure to another makes the recipient feel trusted and leads him to return disclosure as a gesture of willingness to trust the original revealer. This early assumption in self-disclosure reciprocity is mediated by "liking". It has been found, as expected, that liking plays a major role in disclosing behavior. Jourard (1959) stated that female subjects tended to vary the amount of disclosure output to co-workers

as the degree of liking for co-workers varied. He also found evidence for structured dyadic relationships such that if a subject had disclosed much and knew much about a co-worker, the co-worker also knew much about and had disclosed much to her. Kohen's (1975) research suggested that people in "two-person" interactions had a relatively high correlation between liking and self-disclosure among females but not among males.

Social exchange. The social exchange hypothesis assumed that receiving disclosure is a rewarding experience (Worthy, Gary, and Kahn, 1969). These researchers speculated that, since the recipient had received something of value, he or she felt obligated to return something of similar value. Vondracek and Vondracek (1971) found that sixth-graders disclosed more to a male interviewer who was disclosing rather than nondisclosing.

Modeling. The modeling hypothesis is based on reinforcement and imitation from social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Weigel, Weigel, and Chadwick (1969) found that subjects actually disclosed and initiated disclosure to another's initiation. The classic study for modeling disclosure was conducted by Jourard and Resnick (1970), working with disclosing dyads. They found that

low-disclosing subjects disclosed as much as high-disclosing ones when they were paired together. Marlatt and his colleagues (Marlatt, Jacobson, Johnson, and Morrice, 1970) have indicated that clients increase their disclosure of personal problems following exposure to a problem-disclosing model. Stone and Gotlib (1975) have indicated the positive effects of self-disclosure modeling as a means of systematically preparing college students to self-disclose.

Research has indicated that reciprocity effects are not only dependent on liking but also cannot be explained solely by the modeling and social exchange hypothesis (Archer, 1978). According to Archer, attempts to contrast and separate theories of reciprocal disclosure based on modeling and on social exchange are not clear, mainly because of the difficulties in differentiating these two variables in research.

#### Summary of Therapist's Self-Disclosure

Therapist's self-disclosure has been shown to be an important variable influencing the outcome of the therapeutic process. Furthermore, counselor disclosure has been shown to facilitate client disclosure. Existing research suggests that trust-attraction, social exchange and modeling are the three contributing factors that appear to explain the disclosure reciprocity effect in a

therapeutic setting. This study emphasizes the importance of the counselor's self-disclosing behavior where a counselor's reference to his own attitudes and values are necessary in a genuine counseling relationship.

### Development of Self-Disclosure Inventories

The study of self-disclosure has developed into four distinct lines of research: (a) the creation of psychometric devices capable of measuring the trait of self-disclosure; (b) an attempt to measure sex, age, and target differences in self-disclosure; (c) an effort to correlate the trait scores of self-disclosure with other personality variables; and (d) an attempt to find methods of promoting self-disclosing behavior.

The most widely used instrument to assess individual differences in self-disclosure has been Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ). The initial instrument, described by Jourard and Lasakow (1958), consisted of 60 items. The JSDQ required respondents to estimate by means of scale ratings the extent to which they usually disclosed thoughts and feelings about various topics, e.g., personality, body, money, and attitudes to various targets, e.g., mother, father, same-sex friend, or opposite-sex friend. Analyses have shown that the JSDQ consists of three main factors: the parent factor, the boyfriend factor, and the girlfriend factor.

Jourard has also created a shorter 40-item checklist of statements with rated intimacy value. The respondent checked whether the statement had or had not been fully revealed to a particular target (Jourard & Resnick, 1970).

Cozby (1973), in a review of the literature, indicated that there was little evidence to support the predictive validity of the JSDQ. Hurley and Hurley (1969) speculated that there was a failure of validity about the JSDQ to predict self-disclosure, and Jourard (1971) has acknowledged the importance of situational variables in the predictive value of his inventory.

Burhenne and Mirels (1970) have also emphasized the importance of the social situation in the use of the JSDQ. Chelune (1978) speculated that the JSDQ, as a past-behavior measure, was a poor measurement for predicting actual, ongoing disclosing behavior. Other determinants of self-disclosure such as interpersonal and situational components have been noted to be important factors of disclosing behavior (Goodstein and Reinecker, 1974).

Following Jourard's early efforts, the Self-Disclosure Situational Survey (SDSS) was introduced by Chelune (1976) as a means to examine the situational components of self-disclosure inventories. Unlike the

JSDQ which measured the reported disclosure of six topic areas to various target persons, SDSS measures the social-situational determinants of self-disclosure to individuals and groups.

The SDSS includes 20 different questions divided into four groups of five items each. Each item represents a low- to high-intimacy situation for each of four target groups. Thus, the SDSS has been grouped under the general heading of: Friends Alone, Group of Friends, Stranger Alone, and Group of Strangers. This simple twenty-item inventory incorporated both important variables, the interpersonal and the setting condition.

Chelune (1979) reported that since all disclosing occurs within a situational setting, the question of under what circumstance has been the most overlooked aspect in self-disclosure assessment procedures. He concluded:

All disclosures occur within an environmental setting, yet the typical self-report inventory does not specify the setting condition for the subjects or consider its potential impact on the subjects' judgments. Subjects are left on their own to rate their recollections of past disclosures, which most likely vary widely with respect to the settings in which they occurred. Consider the following three

sets of circumstances and their potential contrasting effects on the subject's recollection of the same disclosure. In the first situation our subject, a young male college student, is being driven home by his girlfriend after having drunk too much at a party. He tells his girlfriend he loves her. In the second situation, our subject is at an expensive restaurant having a candlelight dinner with his girlfriend. He tells her that he loves her. Finally, in the third setting, the young man tells his girlfriend that he loves her while having dinner with her parents. Although the target and the topic of disclosure are the same in all three scenarios, the differences in context either mitigate or enhance the perceived valence of the subject's disclosure (1974, p.19).

SDSS taps disclosure to groups as well as single targets and measures disclosure in several settings that differ in intimacy (Chelune, 1976). Unlike "trait" based questionnaires, it is a more sophisticated inventory



since it emphasizes individual differences in disclosure as person-situation interactions (Archer, 1979).

Chelune (1976) reported reliability coefficients of 0.80, 0.89, and 0.80 by the odd-even method in three independent samples numbering 79, 74, and 56, respectively. Test-retest reliability of the SDSS total score has also been reported and found to be 0.85. The correlation between the total score and each of the target groups were 0.76 to 0.85. Chelune (1976) also showed that actual verbal disclosure correlated  $r=0.58$  ( $P < .05$ ) with SDSS Stranger score and interpreted the finding as supportive of the construct validity of the instrument.

#### Summary of Literature Relating to Self-Disclosure Inventories

The validity and reliability of the JSDQ and the SDSS has been examined. It has been shown that there is little evidence to support the predictive validity of the JSDQ. Unlike the JSDQ, the SDSS was found to measure social-situational determinants of self-disclosure and has been based on person-situation interactions. The SDSS was also shown to be reliable and to have stronger construct validity than the JSDQ as well as some evidence of predictive validity. The SDSS will be used in this study.

### Impact of Videotape Recording (VTR) in Counseling

Since the late 1950's, television has been used with much success in the treatment of psychiatric clients. The major focus has been on self-confrontation, with emphasis upon the feedback to the client of his/her own image. Videotherapy enables individuals to gain perspective on their patterns of behavior by getting outside of themselves and confronting themselves from the objective distance of a television viewer (Kubie, 1964). Direct viewing of oneself, rather than being told by others of one's impact, is an experience that can open up the client to the limits of his/her behavior, and support a change (Wilmer, 1969). This experience of the self is multi-dimensional and works at deep levels that have been hard to reach in more traditional forms of therapy (Ivey, 1970).

The demand for the use of different mechanical media such as simulation film and VTR in counseling has been noted by Kagan (1970). VTR technology has recently become easily available to therapists working with a variety of subject populations in both research and treatment settings.

### Use of Videotape in Therapy

The development of VTR has added a major new dimension to the methodology of therapy (Stern, 1976). For the first time, counselors can see immediately how they have performed.

They can see not only results at once but can practice a given skill repeatedly until it is perfected (Kagan, 1970).

Some of the early work in VTR was performed by Ludsman & Lane (1963) who found video-taped interviews in role playing to be an effective device in counselor education. Walz and Johnston used VTR in 1963 to record counseling sessions and discovered that counselor trainees who viewed the tapes seemed to gain greater self-awareness and personal confidence. They suggested that VTR offered promise as a unique method of assisting counselor trainees to view their interview performance. It appeared to change the trainees' perception without requiring the mediating influence of a supervisor. They further speculated that perhaps the change due to self-discovery could prove to be more permanent than suggestions offered by a supervisor. Therefore, they concluded that VTR provided a technique of training practicum students.

Kagan, Krathwohl, and Miller (1963) modified, with the use of VTR, Bloom's method of simulated recall to secure the maximum effect from the replay of videotapes in counseling. The method was called "Interpersonal Process Recall" (IPR), which provided both the counselor and the client with maximum cues for reliving their encounter through the counseling session. They speculated

that the client, while viewing himself on videotape, felt sufficiently removed from the image of himself on the television screen to react to the "person" on the monitor as being well-known to him, yet not quite him.

#### Videotape Used in Non-Counseling Settings to Change Behavior

Galassi, Galassi, and Gitz (1974) used VTR feedback for assertiveness training with college students. The VTR feedback was part of a training program which included behavioral rehearsal and modeling. The feedback component of the program consisted of viewing samples of rehearsal behavior with comments from the trainer on appropriate or inappropriate performance. Bernal (1969) utilized VTR feedback to train the appropriate use of behavior modification techniques to mothers of children exhibiting high rates of "brat" behaviors.

Among the methods for facilitating self-disclosure, one exciting much interest has been videotape modeling. Self-disclosing behavior in groups has been increased by exposing the group members to a videotape sensitivity group engaging in trust exercises (MacDonald, Games, and Mink, 1972). Other researchers also used videotape models to elicit self-disclosure in both individual counseling and in the group setting (Smith & Lewis, 1974; Annis & Perry, 1978). A possible way to explain such

behaviors was suggested by Bandura's research on learning through models. Bandura (1965) suggested that learning could occur through the individual's noting the experience of others in addition to the direct experiencing of the outcome of his own behavior.

While the literature reporting the results of using the VTR in counseling is generally very enthusiastic, definitive empirical research relating specific VTR techniques to increased teaching effectiveness is still lacking (Walz & Johnston, 1963). Yet, if VTR is used properly, it could facilitate teaching in training counselors and therapists.

#### Summary of Research Relating to VTR in Counseling

VTR in counseling has been shown to be: a) a new dimension to the methodology of therapy; b) an effective tool of behavioral change; c) the purest feedback that has been developed; and d) a training device for therapists seeking to improve their own techniques. It has also demonstrated that there is a lack of substantive research to support these opinions. The current study will provide empirical data on the effectiveness of videotaped models in eliciting self-disclosing behavior in a counseling setting.

#### Summary

Most researchers have accepted the concept that self-disclosure is necessary for an effective and supportive

relationship. An increase in self-disclosure has been associated with an increase in mental health, and in the building of positive relationships. A lack of self-disclosure has been associated with illness, lack of supportive relationships, self-alienation and alienation from other people.

Self-disclosure has become a much-studied phenomenon. Various researchers have studied self-disclosure in actual therapeutic situations with psychometric devices. Despite extensive research on self-disclosing behavior, the results have been hampered by definitional and measurement problems. Reciprocity, trust, modeling and appropriateness were examined as contributing factors of self-disclosure within interpersonal communication. Chelune found that the appropriateness of self-disclosure was the variable not adequately addressed by Jourard and others and devised the SDSS to measure appropriate self-disclosure. This instrument has been shown to overcome the validity problems of the JSDQ, and to clarify some of the confusion within the literature of self-disclosure.

Existing evidence tentatively suggests that an increased willingness to disclose can be taught to therapist trainees as a part of their training. The present study is an attempt to verify this concept, using the SDSS, which has established validity and reliability.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURES

This study investigated the effects of videotape modeling of self-disclosing behavior on counselor trainees in a counseling practicum setting. The two independent variables were sex and videotape modeling. The dependent variables were client self-disclosure, counselor trainee's self-disclosing behavior, the rating of independent judges and the rating of clients. The Self-Disclosure Situation Survey (SDSS) was used to measure counselor trainees and their clients self-disclosure level. The Relationship Inventory (RI) was utilized to measure level of rapport between the counselor trainees and their clients.

#### I. SELECTION OF THE SUBJECTS

The population from which the subjects for this study were chosen consisted of those counselor trainees enrolled in counseling programs at California State University at Fresno (CSUF) during the Spring of 1980. The specific population consisted of approximately 200 students majoring in either Counseling Education or Rehabilitation Counseling.

The sample consisted of 26 counselor trainees who were not selected on a random basis, but were enrolled in Counseling Practicum courses as part of their requirements. There were two sections, both listed under Counselor Education and composed of 7 Rehabilitation counselor trainees and 19 Counseling Education trainees. The subjects were assigned to two groups on the basis of availability of the two different sections in the Counseling Practicum. Both groups were exposed to classroom discussion, role playing, demonstration of counseling, practice counseling sessions with critique by individual supervisors and group counseling.

#### Administration of Pre-test Self-Disclosure Situation Survey (SDSS)

The investigator administered the SDSS to participating counselor trainees at the beginning of the study as a means of assessing an individual's level of self-disclosure within a number of social situations. Then a coin was tossed for each group to determine the experimental (E) and control (C) groups. The E group consisted of 6 males and 6 females and C group numbered 6 males and 8 females.

#### Objectives of Course

The general goals and involvement of training in the Counseling Practicum at CSUF included the following items:



- A. To provide opportunity for application of theoretical and technical knowledge gained from prior experiences, directly or indirectly associated with the Counseling and Guidance training program.
- B. To provide experiences directed toward the improvement of trainee's ability to communicate with clients and to be involved in the necessary activities toward the solution of identified problems.

Each of the subjects of this experiment had completed all of the prerequisite courses in theoretical counseling required for admission to the practicum program.

## II. METHOD

At the time of participation, the subjects understood that they would be expected to respond to a questionnaire concerning self-disclosure. Before directing the subjects to begin the questionnaire, the experimenter stressed that the information to be divulged would be treated strictly in a confidential manner by using a numerical coding procedure. In addition, the experimenter stressed to each group that their most

honest and straight-forward responses were essential to the study, and that much thought was needed to complete the questionnaire.

#### Observation of Videotape Model

Following the above described pre-test procedure, each of the subjects in both the E and C groups observed videotape models of counseling performance for a period of 40 minutes. The videotape model of the E group differed from the C group mainly in the content of the tape. The E group observed videotape models of self-disclosing behavior. This tape was a demonstration of different counselors engaging in mutually revealing dialogues with their clients followed by practice in rating self-disclosure. The C group viewed a videotape model of non-revealing interviewing techniques, followed by role playing to practice the interviewing techniques.

#### Self-Disclosure Activities

Self-disclosure activities were designed for the E group to focus attention on the basic aspects of self-disclosure and exercises related to self-disclosing behavior. The activities required approximately four hours and were divided in five segments: a) illustrating the Self-Disclosure Scale; b) observing and rating of the videotape model; c) perceiving self-disclosure; d) responding with self-disclosure; and e) sharing exercises.

Illustration of Self-Disclosure Scale: Following the observation of the initial videotape models of self-disclosing behavior, the experimenter talked briefly about the different levels of self-disclosure, and the subjects in the E group were exposed to the use of the scale for rating helper response on the level of self-disclosure. The "helpee situation" below was introduced to illustrate four levels of the Self-Disclosure Scale.

Helpee situation. Sixth-grade student to teacher, "Whenever we pick sides at school, I'm always the last one chosen. The kids all know I'm so clumsy. It's really disappointing. Around home I'm the biggest guy, and they all want me to play even though I am a little clumsy. But here, I don't have a chance. What do you think I should do?"

Helper responses. Level 1.0: "I don't really have any idea. Lots of people get left out of things".

Discussion: The helper avoids giving any personal information.

Level 2.0: "You feel it's not fair for them to choose you last".

Discussion: This is a response to the helpee's feelings. It gives no clues as to the helper's reaction or ideas.

Level 3.0: "At one time I felt left out at school, too. I am not sure that the way I solved the problem would work for you. Would you like to tell me more about your situation?"

Discussion: The helper volunteers personal information in general terms. The information offered is relevant to the helpee's problem, keeping the focus of the interaction on the helpee.

Level 4.0: "You know, when I was in sixth grade, no one wanted me on their softball team. It took me a long time to get over that. It sounds like you are experiencing some of the same kind of disappointment I experienced at your age. Maybe we can work this out together."

Discussion: The helper is freely himself. The helpee can see him as a unique individual because the helper has disclosed himself in concrete terms. The helper has acknowledged that he shared the same kind of experience as the helpee and also expressed the uniqueness of his experience without distracting the helpee from his own personal concerns.

Observing and Rating of Videotape Model: Following the above exercise, another 20 minutes of videotape models of self-disclosure was observed. The tapes consisted of four different counseling sessions in which

counselors were engaging in different levels of self-disclosing behavior. The investigator asked the subjects to rate each counselor for the frequency and depth of the self-disclosure by using the Self-Disclosure Scale that was provided to them.

Perceiving Self-Disclosure: This portion of the treatment offered the opportunity to the trainees to respond to the following "problematic helpee situations".

Instruction: Please rate each of the helper responses on the Self-Disclosure Scale, putting the number (1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0) in the blank to the left of the helper response.

Helpee situation 1

Student teacher to another student teacher:

"What was the idea of butting in on my class today? I can handle Jerry by myself. I know he was fooling around, and I was just waiting until he was in deep enough that he couldn't lie his way out again."

Helper response: .

- \_\_\_1. "I knew what I was doing, if you let that little runt get too far ahead of you, you'll never be able to keep him in line."
- \_\_\_2. "Meddling with your class has really made you angry, especially since you knew what

you were going to do with Jerry."

- \_\_\_3. "I know you're angry. I've had people interfere in my class, too, and really gets me mad."
- \_\_\_4. "My interfering messed up all your plans. You're wondering how could I do something like that."
- \_\_\_5. "How can you be so sure you were going to be so effective with Jerry?"
- \_\_\_6. "I realized I was out of line as soon as I corrected Jerry, but it was too late. I appreciated your not saying anything in class. If that had been me, I would have blown up on the spot."

Helpee situation 2

Third-grader to teacher: "I'm sure glad I was placed in your room."

Helper response:

- \_\_\_7. "That really makes me feel happy to hear you say that."
- \_\_\_8. "Oh?"
- \_\_\_9. "You're really glad I am your teacher instead of some else."
- \_\_\_10. "you're darn lucky to have me. I really know how to keep discipline in my class."

- \_\_11. (Hugging child) "Gee, I feel so good  
hearing you say how much you like me."

Please calculate your average discrepancy score  
using the answer key.

#### Answer Key for

#### Perceiving Self-Disclosure

Helpee situation 1      Helpee situation 2

1. 1.0	7. 3.0
2. 2.0	8. 1.0
3. 3.0	9. 2.0
4. 2.0	10. 1.0
5. 2.0	11. 4.0
6. 4.0	

Responding with Self-Disclosure: Following the  
above exercise, another four "helpee situations" were  
introduced and the subjects were asked to formulate  
their own response as though they were responding to  
the helpee.

Behavioral Objective: The trainee should be able  
to write helper responses at level 3.0 on the Self-  
Disclosure Scale.

Instruction: Please read the helpee situation and  
formulate your response as though you were speaking to  
the helpee. Write it down as quickly as possible to  
retain the conversational style. Check your response  
against the criteria of a level 3.0 response on the Self-  
Disclosure Scale.

1. Student to teacher: "I don't know what to do this summer. Part of me wants to do nothing but relax, and part of me wants to get a job."

Helper Response \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Child to mother: "Times have changed since you were a kid. You're old-fashioned. All the girls my age wear lipstick now. I'm not too young to wear it."

Helper Response \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Student to teacher: "I wish I weren't a kid. I'll sure be glad when I'm grown up. It's no fun being a kid."

Helper Response \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Student to teacher: "I got an 'F' in math last week, but I just can't make myself study. I clean up my room, wax the car, or read magazines even though I've got another big test coming up. I want to do well but just can't get down to work."

Helper Response \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



Sharing exercises: The subjects in E group were asked to pick a "partner" whom they knew least in the group and engage in a dyad experiment lasting at least 30 minutes. The subjects were told that they had 15 minutes to share with the "partner" his or her responses to the following:

1. What is a particular happy experience that you remember?
2. What was an especially significant experience that happened to you?
3. What kind of things make you especially proud of yourself, elated, full of self-esteem or respect?
4. Who are you?
5. How are you feeling now?

The subjects were instructed not to ask questions of the person talking, or during the dyad, and to be aware of their own feelings at different times, and be mutually aware of the interaction. After each person in the group had the chance to respond to the questions, the group as a whole discussed the following questions:

1. Did you enjoy doing this? Why or why not?
2. Did you learn something new about your partner?
3. Which of the person's four responses did the most to help you get to know him or her?

Following the above treatment, both groups were assigned clients and audiotapes of their counseling sessions were recorded. E students were provided feedback in terms of self-disclosure with their clients on a weekly basis for three weeks.

Independent Judgment of Audio-tape Recording and Rating by Client

Initially, it was planned to have the supervisors at CSUF do the rating. However, it soon became evident that lack of time was the supervisors' concern. Two judges were trained to rate the subjects' audiotapes in terms of self-disclosure, using Carkhuff scales. The judges were two therapists, one working on his doctorate at the University of California at Berkeley, and the other, a licensed clinical psychologist, holding a Ph.D. degree. In addition, at the end of the third counseling session, clients of both E and C groups completed the SDSS and the RI to measure client's level of disclosure and level of rapport.

The interviews were tape recorded and, from each interview, three two-minute segments were randomly selected, assigned code numbers, and randomly recorded on a master tape. The training session with the judges took place in the Way Home Counseling Center at San Francisco, California. After the purpose of the study

had been explained, the direct preparation for training the raters in the use of the instrument began. The master tape was played, and the raters were asked to complete the instrument without discussion. A comparison was made of two individual ratings of the tape. Where variation occurred, a discussion ensued which helped to clarify the various reasons stated by the raters for making their judgments. The tape was again re-played to refine, still further, the bases for arriving at rating decisions. This process was continued until the two judges were in perfect agreement on all their ratings, and the mean of the ratings was used as an index of the trainee's self-disclosure (Appendix D).

### III. THE INSTRUMENTS

#### Self-Disclosure Situational Survey (SDSS)

SDSS was used in this study to measure self-disclosure. This twenty-item inventory was developed by Chelune (1976), and it combined both interpersonal and setting condition variables of self-report disclosure inventories (See Appendix A). The SDSS includes 20 different social situations that are designed to sample various circumstances where a person may be involved in social interaction. The 20 items are divided into four groups of five items each, according to the target person or persons involved. The groups were obtained on

a rational basis; they express a 2x2 division between Friend and Stranger with single and group subdivision. Thus, the SDSS situations have been grouped under the general heading of: Friend, Group of Friends, Stranger, and Group of Strangers. Within each of these target groups, five situations were ranked by raters according to the rated intimacy level of the setting condition.

The SDSS can be administered individually or in a group and takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. The subjects were instructed to imagine themselves in each of the 20 social situations and rate each item by using a six-point scale. The rating of 1 expresses a willingness to "discuss only certain topics, and on a superficial level only, if at all, in this situation". The rating of 6 represents a willingness "to express in complete detail personal information about myself in such a way that the other person(s) truly understand(s) where I stand in terms of my feelings and thoughts regarding any topic".

Chelune (1976) reported reliability coefficients of 0.80, 0.89, and 0.80 by the odd-even method in three independent samples numbering 79, 74, and 56, respectively. Test-retest reliability of the SDSS total score has also been reported and found to be 0.85. The correlation

between the total score and each of the target groups were 0.76 to 0.85. Chelune (1976) also showed that actual verbal disclosure correlated  $r=0.58$  ( $P < .05$ ) with SDSS Stranger score and interpreted the finding as supportive of the construct validity of the instrument.

#### The Relationship Inventory (RI)

This inventory has been revised several times since its original development by Barrett-Lennard (1962) and currently consists of 64 items. This instrument originally measured a person's ability to demonstrate to another person his capacity for (1) level of regard, (2) empathy, (3) congruence, (4) unconditionality of regard, and (5) willingness to be known. The willingness to be known factor was found to correlate highly with the congruence factor and was subsequently eliminated by Barrett-Lennard (Appendix C). On the revised 64-item RI, Barrett-Lennard obtained reliability coefficients between 0.96 and 0.92 on the four scales using a test-retest procedure with two- and six-week intervals. The data for the test-retest comparison was gathered from a sample of college students ( $N=40$ ) taking a general introductory course in psychology. Test-retest correlation for the sample of 40 yielded the following  $r$ 's: level of regard, 0.84; empathic understanding, 0.89; congruence, 0.86; and unconditionality, 0.90.

Barrett-Lennard (1962) carried out a formal content-construct validation procedure in which definitions and directions of the variables were given to five judges who were all client-centered counselors. The judges classified each item as either a positive or negative indicator of the variable in question. There was perfect agreement among judges at the level of classifying an item positive or negative, on all items. No predictive validity data are available.

#### The Carkhuff's Scale

Carkhuff (1967) developed several instruments to measure the various dimensions of the "helping relationship" in psychotherapy as hypothesized by Rogers. One of the instruments employed a 5-point scale upon which judges could rate a therapist's level of self-disclosure during a recorded therapeutic situation.

Carkhuff (1968) reported reliability coefficients of 0.79 and 0.81. Pearson product-moment rate-rerate reliabilities have also been reported and been found to be 0.80 (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).

## HYPOTHESES, DATA ANALYSIS AND THE VARIABLES

The Hypotheses

The five hypotheses tested by the present study are:

H<sub>1</sub> Regardless of sex, students in the E group will show more self-disclosing behavior than those of the C group as measured by the SDSS.

H<sub>1</sub> was operationally defined as:

The mean post-test score for counselors receiving self-disclosure training will be significantly greater than the mean post-test score for counselors not receiving self-disclosure training, with the pre-test as the covariate.

H<sub>2</sub> Regardless of sex, students in the experimental group will be rated higher than those of the control group by independent judges in terms of self-disclosing behavior. H<sub>2</sub> was operationally defined as:

The mean post-test score of rating by two judges for counselors receiving self-disclosure training will be significantly greater than mean post-test score for counselors not receiving self-disclosure training.

$H_3$  Regardless of sex, students in the experimental group will be rated higher than those of the control group by their clients in terms of development of rapport as measured by the RI.

$H_3$  was operationally defined as:

The clients of the E group will rate their counselors as having better rapport than the clients of C group, with greater rapport being interpreted as higher score on RI.

$H_4$  Regardless of sex, clients of students who were in the E group will show more self-disclosing behavior than clients of students in the C group as measured by the SDSS.  $H_4$  was operationally defined as:

The mean post-test score for clients receiving counseling from self-disclosing counselors will be significantly greater than the mean post-test score for clients receiving counseling from non-disclosing counselors.



H<sub>5</sub> There will be no difference between sexes on any of the four variables. H<sub>5</sub> was operationally defined as:

There will be no difference between males and females in the study on any of the four dependent variables.

#### Data Analysis and the Variables

The analysis of covariance was used to analyze the relationship between the pre-test and the post-test on the counselor trainee SDSS scores. Three 2x2 ANOVA's were used to study the interaction and the interrelationship of the independent variables, sex and treatment, on the remaining dependent variables. These dependent variables were: 1) student trainee's self-disclosure on SDSS, 2) student's client's self-disclosure on SDSS, 3) the rating of the judges on the Carkhuff's Scale, 4) the rating by clients of counselor trainees on the RI. A difference between the groups was assumed to be tenable when the criterion means for the two groups differed at the 0.05 level of significance.

#### Summary

Methods and procedures used in this study were presented in this chapter. A description of counselor trainee samples and populations and discussion of validity and reliability of SDSS, as well as RI, were

also included. Five hypotheses were listed and the statistical procedures used to test these hypotheses were delineated. The results of the study are presented in the following chapter.

## CHAPTER IV ,

### RESULTS

The problem investigated in this research was to discover ways in which self-disclosing behavior could be taught to counselor trainees as part of their training. Five hypotheses were listed and were operationally defined. The fifth hypothesis consisted of four segments ( $H_{5a}$ ,  $H_{5b}$ ,  $H_{5c}$ , and  $H_{5d}$ ), each related to the four major hypotheses. Each of these hypotheses was subjected to statistical analysis. Descriptive data, hypotheses, and the results of the study are reported below.

#### Inferential Test of Hypotheses

The statistical analyses of this study were computed with the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) at the University of the Pacific with the Durroughs large system.

#### Hypothesis 1

Regardless of sex, students in the E group will show no more self-disclosure behavior than those of the C group as measured by the Self-Disclosure Situational Survey (SDSS).

Hypothesis 5a

There will be no difference between sexes on students' SDSS scores.

Hypothesis 1 was tested using a 2x2 analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) to study the interaction and relationship between treatment and control groups. The independent variables were sex and treatment, and the dependent variable was the student trainee's self-disclosure on the SDSS. Students' pre-test on SDSS scores served as the covariate. As reported in Table 1, the ANCOVA disclosed significant difference ( $F=17.5$ ,  $P < .05$ ) between treatments and no difference was found between sexes on students' SDSS scores. There was also no interaction between treatment and sex. Therefore, hypothesis 1 was rejected, and 5a was not rejected. An examination of table 1 shows that the experimental (self disclosing) group scored significantly higher on the test than the control group. It is also clear that there was no difference between the male and female scores.

Hypothesis 2

Regardless of sex, students in the E group will not be rated higher than those of the C group by independent judges in terms of self-disclosing behavior.

Hypothesis 5b

There will be no difference between sexes on students' rating by two independent judges.

Hypothesis 2 was tested using analysis of variance (ANOVA). The Carkhuff rating scores were used to test this hypothesis. As reported in Table 2, the ANOVA did not disclose significant difference and the null hypothesis was not rejected. Also, no difference was found for treatment, sex or interaction between sex and treatment, and hypothesis 5b was not rejected.

Hypothesis 3

Regardless of sex, students in the E group will not be rated higher than those of the C group by their clients in terms of development of rapport as measured by the Relationship Inventory (RI).

Hypothesis 5c

There will be no difference between sexes on students' ratings by their clients.

Using the two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), the data indicated that the E group had a higher mean than the C group (see Table 3). Significant difference was found for treatment ( $F=8.776$ ,  $P < .05$ ), but none for sex or interaction between sex and treatment. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was rejected and 5c was not rejected.

Hypothesis 4

Regardless of sex, clients of students who were in the E group will show no more self-disclosing behavior than clients of students in the C group as measured by the SDSS.

Hypothesis 5d

There will be no difference between sexes on clients' SDSS scores.

Hypothesis 4 was tested using the two-way ANOVA. The results of this testing are presented in Table 4, and indicate that the F value for Hypothesis 4 did not reach the level of significance established for this study; therefore,  $H_4$  is not rejected. Also, no significance was found for sex or interaction between sex and treatment, and  $H_{5d}$  was not rejected.

Summary

Five hypotheses were tested and results reported. Hypotheses 1 and 3 showed that the treatment had significantly affected the behavior of counselor trainees in terms of their SDSS scores and in terms of their behavior as perceived by their clients as measured on the RI. No differences were found between the sexes on any of the dependent variables, nor were judges' ratings

of counselor trainees or clients' SDSS scores different  
for either E or C groups.

---

The final chapter of this study presents the  
discussion of these findings and the recommendations  
for further study based on the findings of this study.

Table 1  
Summary Results of ANCOVA for Students' Scores on SDSS

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Treatment	958.219	1	958.219	17.5 *
Sex	8.687	1	8.687	0.16
Treatment x Sex	29.902	1	29.902	0.55
Covariate	2210.306	1	2210.306	
Residual	1040.028	19	54.738	
Total	4238.625	23	184.288	

Means  
Treatment

Sex	Self-Disclosing	Conventional	Total
Male	87.2	71.3	79.3
Female	79.3	70.6	75.0
Total	83.3	71.0	



Table 2

Summary Results of Two-Way ANOVA for Judges' Rating  
Treatment by Sex

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Group	0.376	1	0.376	1.098
Sex	0.001	1	0.001	0.003
Group by Sex	0.735	1	0.735	2.145
Residual	6.848	20	0.342	
Total	7.958	23	0.346	

Means  
Treatment

Sex	Self-Disclosing	Conventional	Total
Male	3.50	3.57	3.53
Female	3.83	3.20	3.51
Total	3.66	3.38	

Table 3

Summary Results of Two-Way ANOVA for RI Scores  
Treatment by Sex

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Group	442.680	1	442.680	8.776*
Sex	14.461	1	14.461	0.287
Group by Sex	1.932	1	1.932	0.038
Residual	1008.857	20	50.443	
Total	1484.625	23	64.549	

\*  $P \leq 0.05$

Means  
Treatment

Sex	Self-Disclosing	Conventional	Total
Male	54	45	49.5
Female	55	47	51
Total	54.5	46	

Table 4

Summary Results of Two-Way ANOVA for Client SDSS  
Treatment by Sex

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F
Group	6.155	1	6.155	0.052
Sex	8.480	1	8.480	0.072
Group by Sex	88.008	1	88.008	0.750
Residual	2347.095	20	117.355	
Total	2448.625	23	106.462	

Means  
Treatment

Sex	Self-Disclosing	Conventional	Total
Male	73.16	77.71	75.43
Female	78.16	75.0	76.58
Total	75.66	76.35	

---

## CHAPTER V

### ANALYSIS, SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter will be presented in three sections:

a) summary and discussion of present findings; b) conclusions; and c) recommendation for future research.

#### Summary and Discussion

The general purpose of this study was to explore ways in which self-disclosing behavior could be taught to counselor trainees in a counseling practicum setting. It was also proposed to determine the degree, if any, to which videotape modeling could enhance self-disclosing behavior in counselor trainees.

The population under study was from those counselor trainees enrolled in the counseling program at California State University at Fresno. Twenty-four counselor trainees who were not chosen randomly, but were enrolled in counseling practicum constituted the sample studied.

The instruments used to assess the trainees were the Self-Disclosure Situational Survey (SDSS); the Relationship Inventory (RI) and the Carkhuff Scale. An analysis of the scores obtained on two of these three

measures indicated that students who were provided videotape training were rated higher by their clients and showed more self-disclosing behavior than those students who were not involved in the training. A significant difference was found between the means of the pre- and post-test scores of self-disclosing behavior as measured by SDSS.

This finding is in agreement with the studies by Weigel, et al (1969), Jourard and Resnick (1970), where modeling was found to be an effective way to initiate self-disclosing behavior. Research examining the effects of modeling and instruction has shown fairly consistent results in that modeling has been shown to have a significant effect on increasing self-disclosure. Marlatt(1970), found the most powerful technique to be a combination of instruction plus modeling in teaching counseling skills.

Students who participated in the self-disclosure workshop were exposed to both modeling and instruction of self-disclosure. These students not only were "active" participants, but also were exposed to modeling of self-disclosing behavior. Thus, what was suggested by Bandura (1965), that new behavior can be learned through models might have been a possibility that occurred. Indeed, Bandura maintained that learning could occur

through the person noting the experience of others in addition to the direct experience of the outcome of his own behavior. It seems probable that videotape modeling had an effect on students' behavior within the practicum setting. This supports the reports by a number of authors (e.g., MacDonald, 1972, Stone and Gotlib, 1975) that videotape models are effective in presenting appropriate behavior in general and self-disclosure, in particular.

When the students were rated by the independent judges, no significant difference was found between the control group and the experimental group. This may possibly be related to the superiority of videotape over audiotape. Since self-disclosing behavior does not limit itself only to verbal communication, it is reasonable to say that the non-verbal cues which did not appear in the audiotapes could have been detected through videotape. Reports in the literature have supported the importance of non-verbal communication in counseling (Kagan, 1970), and suggested that videotape may possess a variety of distinct advantages when compared with audiotape, generally, and specifically when studying self-disclosing behavior (Wuehler, 1975). In addition, the three two-minute segments may not have been an adequate sample to enable the raters to make a reliable judgment.

When students were rated by their clients, a significant difference was found between the control group and the experimental group, with the experimental group showing a higher mean than the control group. This finding seems to indicate that there is a positive relationship between the counselor's self-disclosure and the outcome of counseling. Indeed, Mowrer (1964), has suggested that counselor's self-disclosure is essential to developing mutual honesty and trust and to enhancing the counseling relationship.

However, there is an argument between Mowrer's finding and studies by the pioneers of humanistic counseling like Jourard (1964), Rogers (1962), Truax and Carkhuff (1969), in which counselors' self-disclosure has been emphasized. These studies described the counselor's self-reference to his/her own attitudes and values as being important in genuine counseling interactions. It is, therefore, not unreasonable to expect a positive relationship between the counselor's self-disclosure and the counseling outcome. It is possible that the treatment had an effect on the counselors' behavior and consequently affected the outcome of their counseling.

When clients were measured for their self-disclosing behavior, no significant difference was found between the

clients of the control group and the clients of the experimental group. Based on the review of the literature, this finding was not expected, and it contrasted with similar findings of Jourard & Jaffee (1970); Pearce & Sharpe (1973); Judd (1978); and Derlega & Chaikin (1975). However, the finding is in agreement with Stunkel (1973), May and Thompson (1973), in which counselors' self-disclosure might elicit a negative effect upon clients' self-disclosure. One possible explanation of the failure to support this hypothesis is that the numbers of sessions for clients might not have been enough in order to show some changes in clients' behavior. If this explanation is accepted, it would suggest that the time factor and number of sessions are equally important variables to elicit self-disclosing behavior.

When students were grouped by sex, no significant difference was found among them in regard to self-disclosing behavior. This finding is in agreement with studies done by Vondracek (1971), and Weigel, Weigel, & Chadwick (1969), and it is representative of the general literature (Cozby, 1973). However, this finding is in contrast with Jourard's (1964) in which sex was found to be related to self-disclosure. Jourard (1964), argued that men were competitive and disclosed less in order to



mystify others; also, he suggested women are closer to their feelings than men are, and they allow others to become more intimate with them than do men.

One possible reason of nonsignificance of sex of subjects could be the level of sophistication of the students in general. Since these students were all graduate students in counseling, it is possible that the ability to self-disclose is already part of their behavioral repertoire and needs only to be elicited by specific cues. Therefore, Jourard's reasoning did not apply to them, and as a result, it closed the gap between male and female in this research.

### Conclusions

1. Counselors trained using videotape modeling of self-disclosing behaviors demonstrated a measurable increase on self-disclosing behavior.

2. It appears that there is a positive relationship between the counselor's self-disclosure and the outcome of counseling.

3. Clients of counselors in this study who took the self-disclosing training did not show more self-disclosing behavior than did clients of counselors who did not receive this training.

4. Sex does not appear to be an important factor in self-disclosure in an adult sample of counselor trainees.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

1. Longitudinal studies should be conducted which assess the impact of self-disclosure training on students for periods of at least two semesters within the counseling practicum setting.

2. This study should be replicated using a larger sample.

3. To determine maximum treatment impact, a longer training exposure to self-disclosing behavior for the subjects is needed.

4. More intensive training for the judges and perhaps more judges are recommended in order to control the rating procedure. In addition, the two-minute segments may not have been an adequate sample to enable the raters to make a reliable judgment.

#### Conclusion

This research was designed to examine the effects of videotape modeling of self-disclosing behavior on counselor trainees. This study attempted to answer such practical questions as: a) can an increased willingness to disclose be taught to counselor trainees as part of

their training? b) to what degree, if any, does videotape modeling enhance self-disclosing behavior on counselor trainees? c) if there is a change in self-disclosing behavior, does this change contribute to the development of rapport between counselor and client?

Conclusions of this study could not statistically validate that counselors' self-disclosure facilitated clients' self-disclosure. However, counselors' self-disclosure was shown to be an important variable influencing the outcome of the counseling process.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of videotape models in eliciting self-disclosure is shown in the current study. This supports that videotaped models are effective in presenting appropriate counseling skills in general and self-disclosure in particular.

## References

- Alger, Ian. Insight and involvement in individual therapy through videotape confrontation. Science and Psychoanalysis, 1971, 18, 27.
- Altman, I. Reciprocity of interpersonal exchange. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 1973, 3, 249-261.
- Altman, I., and Taylor, D.A. Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973.
- Annis, L.V., and Perry, D.F. Self-disclosure modeling in same-sex and mixed-sex unsupervised groups. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 370-372.
- Archer, R.L., and Berg, J.H. Disclosure reciprocity and its limits: a reactance analysis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1978, 14(6), 527-540.
- Bandura, A. Social learning through imitation. In M.R. Jones (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962.
- Bandura, A. Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

- Barrett-Lennard, G.T. Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76, (43, whole No. 562).
- Bem, D.J., and Allen, A. On predicting some of the people some of the time: the search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. Psychological Review, 1974, 81, 506-520.
- Bernal, M. Behavioral feedback in modification of brat behaviors. In R. Gerrtma, Studies in self-cognition: techniques of videotape self-observation in The Behavioral Sciences. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1969.
- Branan, J.M. Client reaction to counselor's use of self-experience. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1967, 45, 568-572.
- Buber, M. I and Thou. New York: Scribner's, 1937.
- Bundza, K.A., and Simonson, N.R. Therapist self-disclosure: its effect on impressions of therapist and willingness to disclose. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1973, 10(3), 215-217.
- Burhenne, D., and Mirels, H.L. Self-disclosure in self-descriptive essays. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 35(3), 409-413.

- Carkhuff, R.R. Toward a comprehensive model of facilitative interpersonal processes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 67-72.
- Carkhuff, R.R., and Berenson, B.G. Beyond Counseling and Therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Cash, T.F. Self-disclosure in the acquaintance process: effects of sex, physical attractiveness, and approval motivation. (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 35, 3572B.
- Chaikin, A.L., and Derlega, V.J. Variables affecting the appropriateness of self-disclosure. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974c, 42(4), 588-593.
- Chaikin, A.L., and others. Neuroticism and disclosure reciprocity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43(1), 13-19.
- Chelune, G.J. Self-disclosure: an elaboration of its basic dimensions. Psychological Reports, 1975a, 36, 79-85.
- Chelune, G.J. Reactions to male and female disclosure at two levels. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976b, 34(5), 1000-1003.

- Chelune, G.J. The self-disclosure situations survey:  
~~a new approach to measuring self-disclosure.~~  
JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology,  
1976c, 6 (1367), 111-112.
- Chelune, G.J. Disclosure flexibility and social-  
situational perceptions. Journal of Consulting  
and Clinical Psychology, 1977a, 45(6), 1139-1143.
- Chelune, G.J. Nature and assessment of self-disclosing  
behavior. In P. McReynolds (Ed.), Advances in  
Psychological Assessment IV. San Francisco:  
Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Chelune, G.J., and Associates. Self-Disclosure. San  
Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Cozby, P.C. Self-disclosure: a literature review.  
Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 79(2), 73-91.
- Derlega, V.J., and Chaikin, A.L. Sharing Intimacy:  
What We Reveal to Others and Why. Englewood Cliffs,  
N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1975.
- Drag, L.R. Experimenter-subject interaction: A  
situational determinant of differential levels of  
self-disclosure. Unpublished master's thesis,  
Department of Psychology, University of Florida,  
1968.
- Egan, G. Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal  
Growth. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Fromm, E. The Sane Society. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1955.

Galassi, J., Galassi, M., and Gitz, M. Assertive training in groups using video feedback. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 390-394.

Goodstein, L.D., and Reinecker, V.M. Factors affecting self-disclosure: a review of the literature. In Brendan A. Maher (Ed.), Progress in Experimental Personality Research. Vol. 7. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Gouldner, A.W. The norm of reciprocity: a preliminary statement. American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 161-178.

Hurley, J.R., and Hurley, S.J. Toward authenticity in measuring self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1969, 16, 271-274.

Ivey, A. Media therapy: a programmed approach to teaching behavioral skills. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 20-26.

Jourard, S.M. A study of self-disclosure. Scientific American, 1958b, 198(5), 77-82.

Jourard, S.M. Healthy personality and self-disclosure. Mental Hygiene, 1959a, 43, 499-507.

Jourard, S.M. Age trends in self-disclosure. Psychological Reports, 1961b, 8, 446.



- Jourard, S.M. Personal Adjustment: An Approach Through the Study of Healthy Personality. (2nd ed.)  
New York: Macmillian, 1963.
- Jourard, S.M. The Transparent Self. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1968.
- Jourard, S.M. Disclosing Man to Himself. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1968.
- Jourard, S.M. Self-Disclosure: An Experimental Analysis of the Transparent Self. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1971a.
- Jourard, S.M. The Transparent Self. (Rev. ed.) New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971b.
- Jourard, S.M., and Jaffe, P.E. Influence of an interviewer's disclosure on the self-disclosing behavior of interviewees. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17(3), 252-257.
- Jourard, S.M., and Lasakow, P. Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958, 56, 91-98.
- Jourard, S.M., and Resnick, J.L. The effect of high revealing subjects on the self-disclosure of low-revealing subjects. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1970, 10, 84-93.
- Jourard, S.M., and Richman, P. Disclosure output and input in college students. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1963, 9, 141-148.

Kagan, N. Multimedia in guidance and counseling.

Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1970, 42, 197-205.

Kagan, N., and Krathwohl, D.R. Studies in human interaction. (Final Report, Grant OE7-32-1410-270) East Lansing, Mich. Educational Publication Service, 1969.

Kahn, M.H. Self-disclosure and impression management as a function of personal goals, target person, and content. (Doctoral dissertation, Miami University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37, 3580B.

Kohen, J.A. The development of reciprocal self-disclosure in opposite-sex interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 404-410.

Kubie, L.S. Some aspects of the significance to psychoanalysis of exposure of a patient to the televised audio-visual reproduction of his activities. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disorders, 148:301-309.

Laudsman, T., and Lane, D. AV media, yes; depersonalization, no. Audio Visual Instruction, 1963, 8, 24-28.

Levin, F.M., and Gergen, K.J. Revealingness, ingratiation, and the disclosure of self. Proceedings of the 77th.

Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1969, 4, 447-448.

— Luft, J. On Human Interaction. Palo Alto, Calif.: National Press, 1969.

MacDonald, A.P., Games, R.G., and Mink, O.G. Film-mediated facilitation of self-disclosure and attraction to sensitivity training. Psychological Reports, 1972, 30(3), 847-857.

Marlatt, G.A., Jacobson, E.A., Johnson, D.L., and Morrice, D.J. Effect of exposure to a model receiving evaluative feedback upon subsequent behavior in an interview. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 104-112.

May, O.P., & Thompson, C.L. Perceived levels of self-disclosure, mental health, and helpfulness of group leaders. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20(4), 349-352.

Mowrer, O.H. The New Group Therapy. New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

— Mulcahy, G.A. Sex differences in patterns of self-disclosure among adolescents: a developmental perspective. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 1973, 2(4), 343-356.

Murphy, K.C., and Strong, S.R. Some effects of similarity self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling

Psychology, 1972, 19(2), 121-124.

- Patterson, M.L. An arousal model of interpersonal intimacy. Psychological Review, 1976, 83, 235-245.
- ✓ Pearce, W.V., and Sharp, S.M. Self-disclosing communication. Journal of Communication, 1973, 23(4), 409-425.
- ✓ Plog, S.C. The disclosure of the self in the United States and Germany. Journal of Social Psychology, 1965, 65, 193-203.
- Powell, W.J. Differential effectiveness of interviewer interventions in an experimental interview. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 210-215.
- Rogers, C.R. The interpersonal relationship: the core of guidance. Harvard Education Review, 1962, 32, 416-429.
- ✓ Rogers, C.R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- ✓ Rosenfeld, L.V., and Civikly, J.M. With Words Unspoken: The Nonverbal Experience. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1976.
- ✓ Sermat, V., and Smyth, M. Content analysis of verbal communication in the development of a relationship: conditions influencing self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26(3), 332-246.

- Shapiro, A., and Swensen, C.H. Self-disclosure as a function of self-concept and sex. Journal of Personality Assessment, 1977, 41(2), 144-149.
- Simonson, N.R. The impact of therapist disclosure on patient disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23(1), 3-6.
- Smith, J.A., and Lewis, W.A. Effect of videotaped models on the communications of college students in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21(1), 78-80.
- Snyder, M. Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1974, 30, 526-537.
- Snyder, M., and Monson, T.C. Persons, situations, and the control of social behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 637-644.
- Stein, W. The myth of the transparent self. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1975, 15, 71-78.
- Stern, L. Video in psychotherapy and therapist training: an introduction and bibliography. Abstracted in the JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1976, 6, 42.
- Stone, G.L., and Gotlib, I. Effect of instructions and modeling on self-disclosure, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22(4), 288-293.

Stunkel, E.H. Interviewee self-disclosure among impulsive

and non-impulsive college students as a function  
of instructions and interviewer disclosure.

(Doctoral dissertation, Emory University, 1972).

Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33,  
5526B.

Taylor, D.A. Self-disclosure as an exchange process:  
reinforcement effects. Paper presented at 81st  
annual meeting of American Psychological Association,  
Montreal, August 1973.

Truax, C.B., and Carkhuff, R.R. Client and therapist  
transparency in the psychotherapeutic encounter.  
Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1965a, 12, 3-9.

Truax, C.B., and Carkhuff, R.R. Toward Effective  
Counseling and Psychotherapy. Chicago: Aldine,  
1967.

Vondracek, S.I., and Vondracek, F. The manipulation and  
measurement of self-disclosure in preadolescents.  
Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 1971, 17(1), 51-58.

Walz, G.R., & Johnston, J.A. Counselors look at  
themselves on videotape. Journal of Counseling  
Psychology, 1963, 10(3), 237-243.

Weigel, R.G., Weigel, V.M., and Chadwick, P.C. Reported  
and projected self-disclosure. Psychological  
Reports, 1969, 24(1), 283-287.

Wilmer, H. A new tool in psychiatry: videotape confrontation. Roche Medical Image and Commentary, August 1969, 19-23.

Wilmot, W.W. Dyadic Communication. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

— Worthy, M., Gary, A.L., and Kahn, G.M. Self-disclosure as an exchange process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 59-63.

Wuehler, P.R. A study of the effects of videotape modeling and counselor/client pre-counseling interaction upon self-disclosure in initial personal assessment feedback counseling interviews. (Doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 3635B.

---

## APPENDIX A



### The Self-Disclosure Situations Survey

This is a survey of 20 different situations to see how people would react to them in terms of how willing they would be to reveal information about themselves in each specific situation. As one of the individuals in this survey, you are to indicate how willing you would be to self-disclose personal information in each situation. Do this by imagining yourself in the situation, and then ask yourself as to how revealing you would generally be.

To record your reactions to a situation, use the Numbered Scale below. Select the number which best indicates the degree of self-disclosure at which you would be comfortable in the situation, and put that number in the blank within the parenthesis in the column opposite the number of the situation. Use this same Numbered Scale for all your answers.

In looking at the numbered Scale, you will see that only the numbers at the far left and far right (1 and 6) have been described. You should, however, use any of the numbers which best represent your reaction to the situation. The numbers from 1 to 6 are to be understood as indicating gradually increasing degrees of willingness to disclose at a personal level in that situation.

#### Numbered Scale

1	2	3	4	5	6
<div data-bbox="223 1255 722 1381"> <p>I would be willing to discuss only certain topics, and on a superficial level only, if at all, in this situation.</p> </div>			<div data-bbox="768 1255 1282 1503"> <p>I would be willing to express, in complete detail, personal information about myself in such a way that the other person(s) truly understand(s) where I stand in terms of my feelings and thoughts regarding any topic.</p> </div>		

On next page is the list of situations. Imagine yourself in each of the situations and then indicate, using the Numbered Scale, the degree to which you would be willing to disclose. Please be sure you answer each item.

Self-Disclosure Situations

- 
- (\_\_\_) 1. You are on a blind date. S-304
- (\_\_\_) 2. You are having dinner at home with you family. GF-305
- (\_\_\_) 3. You are sightseeing with a tour group in Europe.
- (\_\_\_) 4. You are sitting next to a stranger on an airplane. S-302
- (\_\_\_) 5. You are with the family of a friend.
- (\_\_\_) 6. You are in a coffeeshop with some casual friends.
- (\_\_\_) 7. You are being introduced to a group of strangers.
- (\_\_\_) 8. You are a member of an encounter/sensitivity group.
- (\_\_\_) 9. You are at a party with some friends.
- (\_\_\_) 10. You are in the library with a friend.
- (\_\_\_) 11. You have picked up a hitch-hiker while driving.
- (\_\_\_) 12. It's evening and you are alone with you boy or girl friend in his or her home.
- (\_\_\_) 13. You are applying for a job as a public relations consultant.
- (\_\_\_) 14. You are in a discussion group on human sexuality.
- (\_\_\_) 15. You are at a restaurant with you date.
- (\_\_\_) 16. You are meeting your girl or boy friend's parents for the first time.
- (\_\_\_) 17. You are eating lunch alone and a stranger asks if he (she) may join you.
- (\_\_\_) 18. You are taking a walk in a park with you girl or boy friend. F-304
- (\_\_\_) 19. You and a friend are driving to San Francisco.
- (\_\_\_) 20. You are on a picnic with friends.

---

## APPENDIX B

### Client Reaction to Relationship Inventory

In order for your counselor to become more effective helper, it is very important that you take a few minutes and provide some feedback regarding the counseling session that you have just completed.

Please consider each statement with reference to your present relationship with your counselor. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how you feel that it is true, or not true in this relationship. Please mark every one and write in (T or F) true or false.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. He respects me as a person.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. He wants to understand how I see things.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. His interest in me depends on the things I say or do.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. He is comfortable and at ease in our relationship.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. He feels a true liking for me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. He may understand my words but he does not see the way I feel.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Whether I am feeling happy or unhappy with myself makes no real difference to the way he feels about me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. I feel that he puts on a role or front with me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. He is impatient with me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. He nearly always knows exactly what I mean.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. Depending on my behavior, he has a better opinion of me sometimes than he has at other times.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. I feel that he is real and genuine with me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. I feel appreciated by him.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. He looks at what I do from his own point of view.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. His feeling toward me doesn't depend on how I feel toward him.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 16. It makes him uneasy when I ask or talk about certain things.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 17. He is indifferent to me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 18. He usually senses or realizes what I am feeling.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 19. He wants me to be a particular kind of person.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 20. I nearly always feel that what he says expresses exactly what he is feeling and thinking as he says it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 21. He finds me rather dull and uninteresting.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 22. His own attitudes toward some of the things I do or say prevent him from understanding me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 23. I can (or could) be openly critical or appreciative of him without really making him feel any differently about me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 24. He wants me to think that he likes me or understands me more than he really does.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 25. He cares for me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 26. Sometimes he thinks that I feel a certain way, because that's the way he feels.

- \_\_\_\_ 27. He likes certain things about me, and there are other things he does not like.
- \_\_\_\_ 28. He does not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
- \_\_\_\_ 29. I feel that he disapproves of me.
- \_\_\_\_ 30. He realizes what I mean even when I have difficulty in saying it.
- \_\_\_\_ 31. His attitude toward me stays the same: he is not pleased with me sometimes and critical or disappointed at other times.
- \_\_\_\_ 32. Sometimes he is not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
- \_\_\_\_ 33. He just tolerates me.
- \_\_\_\_ 34. He usually understands the whole of what I mean.
- \_\_\_\_ 35. If I show that I am angry with him, he becomes hurt or angry with me too.
- \_\_\_\_ 36. He expresses his true impressions and feelings with me.
- \_\_\_\_ 37. He is friendly and warm with me.
- \_\_\_\_ 38. He just takes no notice of some things that I think or feel.
- \_\_\_\_ 39. How much he likes or dislikes me is not altered by anything that I tell him about myself.
- \_\_\_\_ 40. At times I sense that he is not aware of what he is really feeling with me.
- \_\_\_\_ 41. I feel that he really values me.
- \_\_\_\_ 42. He appreciates exactly how the things I experience feel to me.
- \_\_\_\_ 43. He approves of some things I do, and plainly disapproves of others.
- \_\_\_\_ 44. He is willing to express whatever is actually in his mind with me, including any feelings about himself or about me.
- \_\_\_\_ 45. He doesn't like me for myself.
- \_\_\_\_ 46. At times he thinks that I feel a lot more strongly about a particular thing than I really do.
- \_\_\_\_ 47. Whether I am in good spirits or feeling upset does not make him feel any more or less appreciative of me.
- \_\_\_\_ 48. He is openly himself in our relationship.
- \_\_\_\_ 49. I seem to irritate and bother him.
- \_\_\_\_ 50. He does not realize how sensitive I am about some of the things we discuss.
  
- \_\_\_\_ 51. Whether the ideas and feelings I express are "good" or "bad" seems to make no difference to his feeling toward me.
- \_\_\_\_ 52. There are times when I feel that his outward response to me is quite different from the way he feels underneath.
- \_\_\_\_ 53. At times he feels contempt for me.
- \_\_\_\_ 54. He understands me.
- \_\_\_\_ 55. Sometimes I am more worthwhile in his eyes than I am at other times.
- \_\_\_\_ 56. I have not felt that he tries to hide anything from himself that he feels with me.
- \_\_\_\_ 57. He is truly interested in me.
- \_\_\_\_ 58. His response to me is usually so fixed and automatic that I don't really get through to him.
- \_\_\_\_ 59. I don't think that anything I say or do really changes the way he feels toward me.
- \_\_\_\_ 60. What he says to me often gives a wrong impression of his whole thought or feeling at the time.
- \_\_\_\_ 61. He feels deep affection for me.
- \_\_\_\_ 62. When I am hurt or upset he can recognize my feelings exactly, without becoming upset himself.
- \_\_\_\_ 63. What other people think of me does (or would, if he knew) affect the way he feels toward me.
- \_\_\_\_ 64. I believe that he has feelings he does not tell me about that are causing difficulty in our relationship.

---

## APPENDIX C

## SCALE 5

FACILITATIVE SELF-DISCLOSURE IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES  
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT<sup>5</sup>*Level 1*

The helper appears to attempt actively to remain detached from the helpee(s) and discloses nothing about his own feelings or personality to the helpee(s). If he does disclose himself he does so in a way that is not tuned to the helpee's interests and may even retard the helpee's general progress.

EXAMPLE: The helper may attempt, whether awkwardly or skillfully, to divert the helpee's attention away from focusing upon personal questions concerning the helper, or his self-disclosures may be ego shattering for the helpee and may ultimately cause him to lose faith in the helper.

In summary, the helper actively attempts to remain ambiguous and an unknown quantity to the helpee, or if he is self-disclosing, he does so solely out of his own needs and is oblivious to the needs of the helpee.

*Level 2*

The helper, while not always appearing actively to avoid self-disclosures, never volunteers personal information about himself.

EXAMPLE: The helper may respond briefly to direct questions from the helpee about himself; however, he does so hesitantly and never provides more information about himself than the helpee specifically requests.

In summary, the helpee either does not ask about the personality of the helper or, if he does, the barest minimum of brief, vague, and superficial responses are offered by the helper.

<sup>5</sup> This scale is a revision of earlier versions of the self-disclosure scale (Carkhuff, 1968; Dickenson, 1965; Martin & Carkhuff, 1965; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).

*Level 3*

The helper communicates an openness to volunteering personal information about himself that may be in keeping with the helpee's interest, but this information is often vague and indicates little about the unique character of the helper.

EXAMPLE: While the helper communicates a readiness to disclose personal information and never gives the impression that he does not wish to disclose more about himself, nevertheless, the content of his verbalizations are generally centered upon his reactions to the helpee and his ideas concerning their interaction.

In summary, the helper may introduce more abstract, personal ideas in accord with the helpee's interests, but these ideas do not stamp him as a unique person. Level 3 constitutes the minimum level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

*Level 4*

The helper freely volunteers information about his personal ideas, attitudes, and experiences in accord with the helpee's interests and concerns.

EXAMPLE: The helper may discuss personal ideas in both depth and detail, and his expressions reveal him to be a unique individual.

In summary, the helper is free and spontaneous in volunteering personal information about himself and in so doing may reveal in a constructive fashion quite intimate material about his own feelings, values, and beliefs.

*Level 5*

The helper volunteers very intimate and often detailed material about his own personality and in keeping with the helpee's needs may express information that might be extremely embarrassing under different circumstances or if revealed to an outsider.

EXAMPLE: The helper gives the impression of holding nothing back and of disclosing his feelings and ideas fully and completely to the helpee. If some of his feelings are negative concerning the helpee, the helper employs them constructively as a basis for an open-ended inquiry.

In summary, the helper is operating in a constructive fashion at the most intimate levels of self-disclosure.

Again it is most effective to begin at level 3 where the helper communicates an openness to volunteering a minimal degree of personal information about himself. Although the helper may introduce more